PATENT 450100-04973

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in this application. Claim 1 which is independent, is hereby amended. Claims 9-15 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112.

Claim 3, which was objected to due to an informality, is hereby amended, obviating the objection.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,286 to Pike in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210329 to Aagaard, et al.

Claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,286 to Pike in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210329 to Angaard, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,841,963 to Song, et al.

PATENT 450100-04973

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,3112,86 to Pike in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210329 to Aagaard, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,384,431 to Tusques, et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,286 to Pike in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210329 to Aagaard, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,024 to Peless, et al.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

"...a flat surface portion on which texture for stereo camera diagnosis is provided;

an attitude unit that causes said robot apparatus placed on said diagnostic mat to assume a stance suitable for obtaining an image of the diagnostic mat:

a creation unit adapted to create a distance image based on the image obtained by said stereo camera;

an image detection unit adapted to detect the flat face of said diagnostic mat from said created distance image; and

a measurement unit adapted to measure the flatness of said detected flat face, and verifying the performance of a stereo camera according to whether or not the flatness is great than a standard flatness." (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,311,286 to Pike (hereinafter, merely "Pike") relates to optically measuring the roughness or another dimension of a surface by transmitting a beam of light through a grating member at an angle of incidence relative to the grating member.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0210329 to Aagaard, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Aasgaard") relates to a multiple camera video system. The cameras are remotely controlled in a master-slave configuration. A camera operator at a master pan head

PATENT 450100-04973

selects one of the cameras as the current master and utilizes the master pan head to adjust the telemetry and zoom of the master camera to follow a target object. The telemetry and zoom parameters are then used to calculate corresponding telemetry, zoom, and other parameters for each of the other cameras.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Pike or Aagaard, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or disclose the above-identified features of claim 1.

Specifically, Applicants submit that the cited portions of Pike, specifically column 4, lines 62-64, do not disclose any of the above-identified features of claim 1. Column 4, lines 62-64 disclose that a target surface is "relatively rough and diffusely reflecting".

Applicants submit that such disclosure does not render Claim 1 unpatentable.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the Office Action states that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teach of Pike with that of Asgaard.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no motivation to combine Pike, which discloses an apparatus for measuring actual roughness using a different technique than that described in claim 1, and Aagaard, which discloses camera calibration using a sports ground or scene to be imaged.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of prior art lacks motivation and is a result of improper hindsight. The Office Action appears to have pieced together a mosaic of features from each of the references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

00381783

PATENT 450100-04973

DEPENDENT CLAIMS III.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

Attorneys for Applicants

Thomas F. Presson Reg. No. 41,442

(212) 588-0800